

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. 80x 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

THOMSON LICENSING LLC Two Independence Way Suite 200 PRINCETON, NJ 08540 **COPY MAILED**

DEC 0 5 2007

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of Hui Li, et al.

Application No. 10/761,829

Filed: January 20, 2004 Attorney Docket No. PD030018 **ON PETITION**

This is a decision in response to the petition, filed August 3, 2007, to revive the above-identified application under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b).

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. However, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.34(a), the signature of Jack Schwartz appearing on the petition shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that he is authorized to represent the particular party on whose behalf he acts. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to petitioner. However, if Mr. Schwartz desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. All future correspondence regarding this application file will be directed solely to the address of record.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the non-final Office action mailed July 26, 2006. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed February 23, 2007. In response, on August 3, 2007, the present petition was filed.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of an amendment; (2) the petition fee of \$1,500; and (3) an adequate statement of unintentional delay¹.

Accordingly, the petition is **GRANTED**.

The application is being referred to Technology Center AU 2164 for consideration of the amendment filed August 3, 2007.

¹ 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) requires a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. While the statement is not made by an attorney of record, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3204. Inquiries relating to further prosecution should be directed to the Technology Center.

Sherry D. Brinkley Petitions Examiner Office of Petitions

cc: JACK SCHWARTZ

1350 BROADWAY

SUITE 1510

NEW YORK, NY 10018